

Application No. 10/035,377

Amndt. dated: May 26, 2006

Reply to Office Action mailed: February 01, 2006

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS:

Claims 1-19 are pending in this application; claims 1, 2, 7, 9, 11, 13, 14 and 17 have been amended. No claims have been cancelled and no new claims have been added. Consideration of the claims and the comments below are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC 102

Claims 1-19 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(e) on the basis of US Patent 6,421,777 (Pierre-Louis). As amended, claims 1-19 are believed not to be anticipated by Pierre-Louis or to be rendered unpatentable under 35 USC 103 by Pierre-Louis.

In the Advisory Action mailed May 01, 2006, the Examiner cited to Pierre-Louis col. 10, lines 31-46 and Fig. 5A, 514. In Fig. 5, step 514 designates: "Remote Boot the System Using the Image" with counterpart disclosure at col. 10:44-46 indicating "a remote boot is performed using the boot image (step 514)." Pierre-Louis indicates the description of Fig. 5 is in the context of "setting up a new client and installing the operating system on the client" (col. 10:20-24) and that "... if the boot image does not redirect to a local image on the client, then a remote boot is performed using the boot image (step 514)." It is believed the disclosure by Pierre-Louis of initially setting up a client to remote boot from a server (col. 5:46 to col. 6:58) indicates that the result is downloading a boot image to the client local hard disk – note col. 6:42-38. These comments thus address and traverse the Examiner's reliance on Pierre-Louis in the Office Action mailed February 01, 2006. Note also Pierre-Louis at col. 7:4-30 and col. 9:26-31.

In contrast to Pierre-Louis:

Claim 1 includes recitation of:

"... providing communicative access to the requesting one of the client devices to the selected target boot volume stored at said network storage device, whereby the client is operable to remotely boot over the network from the selected target boot volume without downloading the selected target boot volume to local storage at the requesting client device;"

Application No. 10/035,377

Amndt. dated: May 26, 2006

Reply to Office Action mailed: February 01, 2006

Claim 9 includes recitation of:

"... said server to receive a boot request from a client device broadcast on the network and responding to the boot request by providing remote access to the client-specific image copy stored in the network storage device allocated to the requesting client device to effect a remote boot operation by the requesting client device without downloading said client-specific image copy to local storage at the requesting client device;"

Claim 14 includes recitation of:

"... said server including a communication component that receives the boot requests from the client components and in response to a boot request from a client component provides the requesting client component with remote access to the network storage component to effect a remote boot from the boot image copy allocated to the requesting client component without transferring the client-specific image copy to local storage at the requesting client component;"

Support for these features of the claims may be found in Applicant's specification at page 6, lines 14-21, page 9, lines 17-26, and page 15, lines 6-11, for example.

The independent claims are further distinguished from Pierre-Louis as follows:

Claim 1 includes recitation of:

"... said requesting client device updating its allocated client-specific boot image by creating an image block unique to the requesting client device whereby each of the client-specific images comprises at least one boot image block common to all of the plurality of client devices and at least one boot image block particular to that client device."

Claim 9 includes recitation of:

"... said controller operating to update a client-specific image stored at said network storage device that is allocated to a particular client device by creating a new image block unique to that client device based on updating information received from that client, whereby each client specific-image comprises at least one boot block common to a plurality of said client devices and at least one boot block unique to that client-specific device."

Claim 14 includes recitation of:

"... said server operating to update client-specific images stored at said network storage device, by a write from a client component to create a new client-specific image block unique to that client component, whereby each client specific-image

Application No. 10/035,377

Amndt. dated: May 26, 2006

Reply to Office Action mailed: February 01, 2006

comprises at least one boot block common to a plurality of said client components and at least one boot block unique to that client-specific component."

Support for these features of the amended claims may be found in Applicant's specification at, for example, page 7, lines 1-5, page 12, lines 12-21, et seq., page 15, line 12 to page 16, line 28, and page 17, lines 6-27.

Pierre-Louis neither discloses nor suggests such features. For example, at col. 7:31-40 and Fig. 4, Pierre-Louis discusses "monitoring and changing client remote boot images", disclosing: "... RPL Map 412 contains entries for each client. Each entry includes a client identifier and an identifier of the image that is to be sent to the client in response to a reboot by the client." No disclosure or suggestion is seen in Pierre-Louis that images identified by the RPL map 412 are updated in the manner set forth in any of claims 1, 9 and 14 as set forth above. Claims 1, 9 and 14 are not anticipated by or obvious in view of Pierre-Louis and are allowable.

The features set forth in claims 5, 6, 12, 13, 18 and 19 also are not disclosed or suggested by Pierre-Louis and each of those claims also is independently allowable.

Further, Pierre-Louis does not disclose or suggest creation of client-specific images copies as set forth in any of claims 2-4, or client-specific reverse snapshots including "at least one boot block image unique to that client device" as recited in claim 11 or claim 12. In Pierre-Louis, images stored at the server are merely selected and copies downloaded to clients.

Claims 7, 8, 10, 15, 16 and 17 are allowable together with their parent claims.

All of claims 1-19 are thus believed to be in condition for allowance.

Application No. 10/035,377
Amndt. dated: May 26, 2006
Reply to Office Action mailed: February 01, 2006

CONCLUSION.

Favorable consideration and early allowance of the pending claims are respectfully solicited. If there are any remaining issues that could be resolved by discussion, a telephone call to the undersigned attorney at (425) 402-4638 would be appreciated.

Date: May 26, 2006
Hewlett-Packard Company
Intellectual Property Administration
PO Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

Respectfully submitted,


N. Rhys Merrett
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 27,250